

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 are amended. These amendments are supported by Applicant's specification at least at, page 6, line 20 - page 7, line 2. No new matter is added. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the title of the application. The title is amended to obviate this objection. Withdrawal of the objection to the Title is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claims 7 and 10. Claims 7 and 10 are amended to obviate these objections. Withdrawal of the objections to claims 7 and 10 are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 7, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 7 is amended to obviate this rejection.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0052796 to Tadokoro et al. (hereinafter "Tadokoro"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, a display unit that displays a service list, the service list including a list of the plural services for the document available to the user which the user can use at present, wherein each of the plural services for the document performs specific processing on data related to the document. Claim 7 recites similar method steps.

Tadokoro teaches, at, e.g., paragraph [0077], "FIG. 12 shows an example of the screen svc01 for starting the common service to be displayed on the display block 317 of the service access apparatus 301." Tadokoro teaches in Fig. 12 reserving travel to Hawaii, element 1210,

travel plan, element 1220, and personally needed services. Further, Tadokoro teaches, at, e.g., Fig. 6, element 603, service name. Example service names including Travel plan, Taxi reservation and air ticket reservation (see, e.g., element 603a, Fig. 6 of Tadokoro). The services taught by Tadokoro cannot reasonably be considered to be services for the document, as recited in the pending claims. Further, none of the above service can reasonably be considered to teach each of the plural services for the document performs specific processing on data related to the document. Thus, Tadokoro cannot reasonably be considered to teach the above features recited in claims 1 and 7.

For at least the foregoing reason, Tadokoro cannot reasonably be considered to teach the combinations of all of the features positively recited in claims 1 and 7. Further, Tadokoro cannot reasonably be considered to teach the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 4 and 8 for at least the dependence of these claims on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tadokoro are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tadokoro in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,851,115 to Cheyer et al. (hereinafter "Cheyer"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.


The Office Action concedes that Tadokoro does not teach wherein the service acquisition unit determines and acquires a service having minimum restrictions for each of the functions constituting the job flow, and the cooperation instruction information creation unit creates the cooperation instruction information by associating the respective plural services acquired by the service acquisition unit with the respective functions constituting the job flow. The Office Action asserts that Cheyer remedies these shortfalls of Tadokoro. However, as argued above, Tadokoro cannot reasonably be considered have suggested the

combinations of all of the features recited in claims 1 and 7. Cheyer, as applied to claims 1 and 7, does not remedy these shortfalls of Tadokoro. Therefore, the combination of Tadokoro with Cheyer cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 6 and 10 for at least the dependence of these claims on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tadokoro in view of Cheyer are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,  


James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III  
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:MIL/add

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: January 12, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**  
Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461